REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 19-25 were rejected and the drawing was objected to. By the present Response, a new formal drawing is appended. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Objection to the Drawing

The drawing was objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(a) because the drawing failed to particularly point out the subject matter as recited in claims 24 and 25. A replacement drawing sheet is hereby submitted with amended Figure 1. The amendment is believed to overcome the objection formulated by the Examiner. Applicants have also amended the specification in conformance with the amendment to the drawing. No new subject matter is added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 19, 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,978,530 (hereinafter "Braeckman"). The Examiner also rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braeckman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,377 (hereinafter "Heglund"). The Examiner, further, rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braeckman in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,958,317 (hereinafter "Peart").

Claim 19 and the claims depending therefrom

Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, a flexible stator bar. The stator bar includes a stranded conductor having a rectangular cross-sectional profile and a thermoplastic elastomeric insulating material disposed about the stranded conductor. The stranded conductor includes a plurality of wires having a gauge dimension to impart flexibility to the stator bar.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as being unpatentable over Braeckman. Applicants have carefully reviewed Braeckman and respectfully submit that Braeckman does not teach or disclose a material (referred by reference numeral 5 in Figure 5 of Braeckman) for insulating the stator as recited in independent claim 19.

According to the Examiner, the material 5 disclosed in Braeckman is equivalent to the thermoplastic elastomeric insulating material in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the thermoplastic elastomeric insulating material recited in claim 19, apart from having insulating properties, also exhibits rubber-like properties allowing for thermoplastic processing, such as by extrusion. Applicants also submit that the choice of the thermoplastic elastomeric insulating material in the present application is further based on properties such as high extensibility, mechanical recovery, resiliency and low temperature ductility. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that by employing the thermoplastic elastomeric insulating materials in the construction of the stator bars, problems such as cracking of the insulating material due to flexing of the stator bar are avoided. Applicants also submit that oxidation of the electrically conductive copper strands over time will be prevented.

On the contrary, while Braeckman discloses the use of material 5, it fails to disclose any of the other associated properties for the material. Braeckman, further, fails to teach of any other desired property of the material except that the material has insulating properties. Applicants respectfully submit that in the absence of the aforementioned properties, the material disclosed by Braeckman will not function as desired for the stator bar recited in claim 19.

Indeed, the reference at column 2, lines 27-32 of Braeckman to "as commonly known in the art" does not support the Examiner's position. On the contrary, thermoplastic insulating layers are not commonplace in such applications. One skilled in the art would, more likely, conclude that more conventional taping or varnishing would be employed in the finished product, particularly for stator coils, the operating temperatures of which could melt thermoplastics. At the very least, the *only* teaching of the use of any thermoplastic is in the present application itself, and not in Braeckman.

For a *prima facia* case of obviousness, the Examiner must set forth the differences in the claim over the applied reference, set forth the proposed modifications of the reference, which would be necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and explain why the proposed modification would be obvious. In view of the deficiencies of Braeckman, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is allowable over Braeckman and request the Examiner to reconsider rejection of the claim.

Claims 20-25 depend directly or indirectly on an allowable base claim. In view of such dependency, as well as for the subject matter they separately recite, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-25 are allowable and request the Examiner to reconsider rejection of the claims.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/14/2005

Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the drawings originally filed in the application with the formal drawings appended to this response. No new subject matter is added.